

1  
2  
3  
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 \* \* \*

7 JOSE MENDOZA, JR., et al.,

8 Plaintiff(s),

9 v.

10 AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION  
11 INTERNATIONAL, et al.,

12 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:18-CV-959 JCM (NJK)

ORDER

13  
14 Presently before the court is the matter of *Mendoza et al v. Amalgamated Transit Union*  
15 *International et al*, case no. 2:18-cv-00959-JCM-CWH (“*Mendoza II*”).

16 On Tuesday, March 26, 2019, the court held a hearing to give the parties an opportunity  
17 to show cause why the court should not consolidate this case with related case, no. 2:17-cv-  
18 02485-JCM-CWH (“*Mendoza I*”). (ECF No. 92). As the parties did not object, the court  
19 ordered that the related cases be consolidated. (ECF No. 93).

20 To avoid undue prejudice to the parties, the court will deny without prejudice the pending  
21 motions in *Mendoza I*. See (ECF Nos. 66–68, 80, 89). The parties shall be permitted to renew  
22 the motions once discovery in *Mendoza II* has concluded.

23 This course of proceedings will allow the court to resolve any motions for summary  
24 judgment as to the claims in both cases simultaneously, thereby preserving judicial resources and  
25 promoting the expeditious disposition of these related actions. See, e.g., *Dietz v. Bouldin*, 136 S.  
26 Ct. 1885, 1892 (2016) (“This Court has also held that district courts have the inherent authority  
27 to manage their dockets and courtrooms with a view toward the efficient and expedient  
28 resolution of cases.”).

